

| | | | |
|--------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|--|
| Interview Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
| | 09/847,005 | WONG ET AL. | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Yuwen Pan | 2682 | |

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Yuwen Pan. (3) Samuel F. Wood.
 (2) Tomas A. Ward. (4) _____

Date of Interview: 12 October 2004.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
 c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☒ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
 If Yes, brief description: _____

Claim(s) discussed: 46.

Identification of prior art discussed: _____

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: arguments are exchanged based on last declarations, the examiner suggested the applicant and application's representative to amend the claim language coherent with the specification's language.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

 Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: the 112 first paragraph issue still exists, which the claimed limitation, "a specified amount of bandwidth" is unsupported by the original specification, furthermore under the presumption that "a specified amount of bandwidth" is equivalent to the total amount of data to be transmitted and the example of the last declaration, the term bandwidth is ambiguous.